

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Clause	Page
M.1	GENERAL	M-1
M.2	EVALUATION OF OFFERS FOR MULTIPLE AWARDS.....	M-2
M.3	OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA	M-2
M.4	EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	M-2

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 GENERAL

- (a) DOE has established a Source Evaluation Panel (SEP) to evaluate proposals submitted for this acquisition. Using the evaluation criteria set forth in this Section M, proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented by the DEAR and DOE acquisition policies and procedures.
- (b) The proposal preparation instructions contained in Section L are designed to provide guidance to offerors concerning the type and depth of information the SEP considers necessary to conduct an informed evaluation of each proposal. A proposal may be eliminated from further consideration before detailed evaluation if it is considered so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face.
- (c) While the Government intends to award contracts without conducting discussions, a competitive range may be established and discussions conducted after detailed initial evaluations if it is in the Government's best interest. Offerors in the competitive range (if established) should be prepared to respond to requests by the SEP for oral and/or written discussions, or other information requests as may be deemed necessary by the SEP to assist the evaluation process.
- (d) Offerors are notified that in the event a competitive range is established, in accordance with Section 4103 of Public Law 104-106 a limit on the number of proposals in the competitive range may be established, using the criteria specified in this Section M, that will permit an efficient competition among those proposals rated most highly in accordance with such criteria.
- (e) DOE may solicit information regarding offerors from available sources, including references identified by offerors and experience data concerning offerors' past performances, and shall consider such information in its evaluations.
- (f) When the term "offeror" is used, it includes the prime contractor and all teaming contractors.

Note: Because this solicitation contemplates the award of multiple contracts, the words "contract" or "award" shall be interpreted to mean "contracts" or "awards" where necessary.

M.2 EVALUATION OF OFFERS FOR MULTIPLE AWARDS

- (a) It is anticipated that there shall be between three and five awards resulting from this solicitation. However, the Government reserves the right to make any number of awards, or no awards, if it is considered to be in the Government=s best interest to do so. It is further anticipated that at least one award shall be reserved as a small business set-aside.
- (b) Awards shall be made to those responsible offerors whose offers, conforming to this solicitation, are considered most advantageous to the Government, considering the evaluation criteria in this Section M.

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

- (a) Evaluations. For the initial and any subsequent evaluations, there are two categories of evaluation criteria: Performance Approach criteria and Cost/Rate criteria. The Performance Approach criteria shall be point scored and assigned an adjectival rating. The criteria are in descending order of importance and have been assigned the following evaluation percentages.

Performance Approach Criteria		Total 100%
Criterion 1:	Management Approach	55%
Criterion 2:	Past Performance/Experience	25%
Criterion 3:	Subcontracting Approach	20%

- (b) The Cost/Rate criteria shall not be point scored or receive an adjectival rating, but shall be evaluated in accordance with paragraph M.4 below. Criteria other than Cost/Rate criteria are significantly more important than Cost/Rate criteria. Cost/Rate criteria become more important as differences in point scores of other criteria decrease. If the proposed rates of a higher scored proposal are higher than other proposals being considered for award, the Government shall determine if the advantages of the higher scored proposal are worth the additional rate costs.

M.4 EVALUATION CRITERIA

- (a) Performance Approach (reference Volume III).
 - (1) Criterion 1: Management Approach. Subcriterion are in descending order of importance. The proposal shall be evaluated on the offeror=s discussion of:

- (i) The principles, systems and procedures used to plan, manage, assign, track, and integrate internal resources, subcontractors, affiliates and teaming contractors, and define their functions and roles (task management);
 - (ii) Staffing, including key personnel (the program manager), resources, skill mix, experience, capabilities, and the offeror=s technical approach to Section C, Statement of Work;
 - (iii) The decision making authority of the program manager and any designated project manager; negotiation authorities; to whom the program manager reports; the process to be followed in obtaining decisions beyond the program manager=s authority; and conflict resolution over resources not under the program manager=s direct control;
 - (iv) The lines of communication, including offeror-internal communication, and external (e.g., between the offeror and the Government) communication. The offeror shall discuss how it will be prepared to respond promptly to performance problems or program changes; and
 - (v) How the program manager shall obtain support from other corporate elements, including any subcontractors, consultants, affiliates, and all teaming contractor arrangements.
- (2) Criterion 2: Past Performance. The offeror=s past performance history and relevant experience shall be evaluated. The subcriteria are in descending order of importance. The proposal shall be evaluated on:
- (i) Relevance of past performance in regard to size, complexity, and areas of technical expertise set forth in Section C, Statement of Work; and
 - (ii) Customer satisfaction rating as derived from responses to the Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment L-3).

Sources other than references provided in the proposal may be contacted and used by the Government, and information received may be used in the evaluation of the offeror=s past performance. Offerors lacking any past performance histories shall receive neutral evaluations for past performance.

- (3) Criterion 3: Subcontracting Approach. Subcriterion are of equal importance. The proposal shall be evaluated on the offeror=s description of:
 - (i) Its procedures for source selection, including make-or-buy decisions; how performance status is determined, assessed, and projected through subcontract completion; selection of subcontract type; and subcontract cost control; and
 - (ii) The efforts which will be used to further socio-economic goals and to obtain participation of small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned business concerns.
- (b) Cost/Rate Proposals (reference Schedule B and Volume II). The rate proposal shall be evaluated on reasonableness, appropriateness of proposed rates, completeness, and the offeror=s understanding of the solicitation requirements. An unrealistic rate proposal may be evidence of the offeror=s lack of, or poor understanding of, solicitation requirements.